

# M E E T I N G   M I N U T E S

*Meeting:*    Evergreen Visioning Project Meeting #4

*Date:*        November 19, 2003

---

The fourth meeting of the Evergreen Visioning Project Task Force was held on November 19, 2003 at the Eastridge Mall Community Room at 7:00 PM.

**Task Force Attendees Present:** Alan Covington (Charrette participant), Bill Kozlovsky (Quimby Hills), Chris Corpus (Charrette participant, KONA SNI), Daniel Gould (Silver Creek Valley Country Club), Garth Cummings (Charrette Participant), Khanh Nguyen (Charrette participant, West Evergreen SNI), Lillian Jones (Charrette participant), Mark Milioto (Evergreen Little League), Rick Caton (Charrette participant), Scott Nickle (Charrette participant), Steve Tedesco (Charrette Participant, Boys & Girls Club), Sylvia Alvarez (Charrette participant, EESD Board of Trustees), Tom Andrade (Charrette participant, EESD Superintendent), Vince Songcayawon (EBPA)

**Members of the Public Present:** John & Janet Brown (Pala Rancho Neighborhood), Tim Johnson (Alternate, Silver Creek Valley Country Club)

**Other:** Councilmember Dave Cortese, PBCE Deputy Director Laurel Prevetti, Bonnie Moss, Tom Armstrong (HMH Engineers), Bo Radonovich (Mission Valley Properties), Steve Dunn (Legacy Partners), Jim Wooton (Arcadia) Rabia Chaudhry

## I.        **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION**

Councilmember Cortese welcomed the group and asked that they keep their fellow neighbors up to date on what is happening at these meetings.

## II.       **CONTINUE DISCUSSION OF DRAFT GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR VISIONING PROJECT**

The group continued its efforts to complete edits to the guiding principles. Cortese pointed out that Laurel Prevetti has spent much time on modifying these and that this latest iteration contains outcomes and purposes. Cortese went through each key outcome and asked for comments.

Key Outcomes 1/2 - *Task Force member Steve Tedesco* asked what the "greenline" is and Prevetti replied that it is a boundary around the city beyond which development is not permitted (even with council override) as per Measure K. *Task Force Member Bill Kozlovsky* commented that had trouble with point one under this outcome as well as point three under Key Outcome 5. Cortese responded that his (Kozlovsky's) comments would be noted for the record, that he is not rejecting these ideas but not endorsing them either. *Task Force member Dan Gould* commented that point six of Key Outcome 2 seems contradictory to point four of Key Outcome 6. Prevetti responded that the former could be

---

broadly applicable and the latter more defined, particularly as it relates to transit oriented development (TOD). This will be added to Key Outcome 2, point six. Task Force member Alan Covington asked what is new development. Prevetti replied that it is basically any new construction in the community. Cortese added that the property at Quimby and White Roads is also a site under consideration for (re) development. Covington stated that the need to acknowledge that some development will be revitalization versus new construction but still all types must conform to these guiding principles.

Covington asked what “hodge-podge” development means and does it imply “non-integrated?” Cortese responded that this point could be removed because it’s covered elsewhere and in different terms. Tedesco suggested removal of the word “slum” and that this point be rewritten to read “encourage renovation, rehabilitation and revitalization of commercial and residential properties.” Kozlovsky asked about the point, “Enforce the City’s blight ordinance.” Cortese suggested removing this point. *Task Force member Tom Andrade* suggested integrating points 14 and 15 of Key Outcome Two. Covington asked how realistic Key Outcome 2 – Point 14 is, given the costs. Cortese responded that the San Jose Municipal Code allows developers to either under-ground utilities or pay an in-lieu fee (although the latter is usually much lower than the costs involved in undergrounding.) In any case, this item can be addressed when the economy rebounds.

Key Outcome 3 - *Task Force member Rick Caton* asked what “internalize” means in the context of point five. Furthermore, can we, within our sphere of influence, locate jobs here? Cortese responded that to internalize traffic means to provide things that would force you to not have to cross Highway 101. This point can be modified to indicate the desire to locate quality jobs here. Caton recommended modifying this point to read, “attempt to internalize.” With respect to point 10, Caton asked that “ensure” be replaced with “encourage.” Covington asked if light rail is a near reality and should the group account for the fact that it may not be. Cortese replied that our segment of the rail system is pretty much locked in. Kozlovsky asked if grid streets were more efficient than the streets found in the Evergreen Specific Plan and Prevetti responded yes.

Key Outcome 4 – Prevetti commented that “placemaking” refers to the process of making places look/act attractive. Covington asked that “placemaking” be removed. *Task Force member Gordon Lund* asked that “outdoor” be removed from point two. *Task Force member Dan Gould* asked the group to consider including health services. Kozlovsky commented that it’s possible to have more than one farmer’s market in Evergreen and that should be noted in point three.

Key Outcome 5 – Prevetti commented that points one and five will be consolidated. Gould commented that point one should be rewritten to state that transportation systems should support the population and not vice versa. Prevetti will correct this.

Key Outcome 6 – Prevetti said that in point one, “light rail” will be replaced with “transit corridor” in order to account for any possible scenarios.

Cortese congratulated the group for their efforts. While this document shouldn’t be changed, if the field trip provokes thoughts on this matter then people should feel comfortable in bringing those up. Caton suggested adding “Bubb Road” to our field trip destination list.

---

## II. PREVIEW OF COMMUNITY AMENITY LIST

Cortese reviewed the proposed community amenities list with the group and provided comments on each:

Item 1 - At the next Visioning Project Meeting staff will provide copies of the proposed Thompson Creek Trail.

Item 2 – This amenity is absent in Evergreen and is sorely needed.

Item 3 – The cost will vary depending on what size is ultimately installed.

Item 4 – Staff will review Greenprint to determine what items are outstanding for our district.

Item 5 – There was a lengthy community process that lead to this masterplan's development and there is five million dollars in assessment money that will go towards this.

Item 6 – Money is available for construction (thanks to Measure O?) but not operations and maintenance. In theory the facilities district built by developer contributions could go towards this.

Item 7 – this is another amenity absent in Evergreen but we have no specifics as to what it would look like.

Item 8 – this will be changed to read, "KONA and West Evergreen"

Items 9, 10, 11, 12 – all were presented by Parsons Technology

Item 13 – although this isn't in District 8, its solution would trickle down to relief for Evergreen

Items 14, 15 – these have already been discussed. Item 15 would not be funded by our facilities district.

*Task Force member Vince Soncayawon* asked about including the closure of Reid Hillview Airport. Cortese responded that he was unsure if this is within our sphere of influence but at the very least we can speak on it (at a future meeting) as an informational item. *Task Force member Khanh Nguyen* asked if we could add a police station to the list. Cortese said it could be added as a possibility. He also said that the under-grounding of utilities would be added to this list.

## III. NEXT STEPS

The meeting adjourned at 9PM.